DIRECT-TO-REVERBERANT RATIO ESTIMATION ON THE ACE CORPUS USING A TWO-CHANNEL BEAMFORMER

James Eaton and Patrick A. Naylor

Department of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Imperial College London, UK

arXiv:1510.07546v1 [cs.SD] 26 Oct 2015

ABSTRACT

Direct-to-Reverberant Ratio (DRR) is an important measure for characterizing the properties of a room. The recently proposed DRR Estimation using a Null-Steered Beamformer (DENBE) algorithm was originally tested on simulated data where noise was artificially added to the speech after convolution with impulse responses simulated using the image-source method. This paper evaluates the performance of this algorithm on speech convolved with measured impulse responses and noise using the Acoustic Characterization of Environments (ACE) Evaluation corpus. The fullband DRR estimation performance of the DENBE algorithm exceeds that of the baselines in all Signal-to-Noise Ratios (SNRs) and noise types. In addition, estimation of the DRR in one third-octave ISO frequency bands is demonstrated.

Index Terms— Direct-to-Reverberant ratio, Speech processing, Acoustic impulse response

1. INTRODUCTION

The acoustic properties of a room can be described by its Acoustic Impulse Response (AIR). From the AIR, measured for example using an exponential sinusoidal sweep [1], the acoustic parameters of Reverberation Time (T_{60}) and Direct-to-Reverberant Ratio (DRR) can be determined using standardized methods such as [2]. The performance of speech enhancement and speech recognition may be assisted with knowledge of these parameters. In practical situations such as mobile telecommunications, though, the AIR is seldom available, or easy to estimate. In which case the acoustic parameters describing the room must be determined from the speech recorded in the room using blind estimators such as [3].

The presence of ambient and sensor noise must also be considered. The total signal model is as follows:

$$y(n) = x(n) * h(n) + \nu(n), \tag{1}$$

where $y(n)$ is the sampled noisy reverberant speech, $x(n)$ is the sampled anechoic speech, $h(n)$ is the sampled AIR, and $\nu(n)$ is the sampled additive noise.

It is common practice in the field of speech processing to use simulated noisy reverberant speech based on anechoic speech corpi such as TIMIT [4] convolved with simulated AIRs using the image-source method [5], and with additive noise from corpi such as NOISEX-92 [6]. A drawback of using pre-recorded noise sources is that any additive noise may have been recorded in a substantially different environment to the AIR being simulated. Without the AIRs of the noises sources, pre-recorded noise may lead to misleading estimation results when estimating non-intrusively from such noisy reverberant speech because the decays identified by the estimator may originate from the acoustic environment of the pre-recorded noise at low Signal-to-Noise Ratios (SNRs). A commonly used source of babble noise [6] has a clearly audible room acoustic.

Part of the motivation for the Acoustic Characterization of Environments (ACE) corpus [7] was to overcome this problem. The ACE corpus provides a set of matched recorded AIRs and noises including ambient, fan and babble noise. The babble noise was recorded using multiple speakers recorded in the same room as the AIR under the same conditions.

Whilst the DRR Estimation using a Null-Steered Beamformer (DENBE) algorithm [8] was tested in simulated data, the ACE challenge has provided the opportunity to evaluate the algorithm in more realistic scenarios where the Direction-of-Arrival (DoA) of the speech is not known and must be accommodated by the algorithm, and also the noise must be estimated. The DRR estimate will be affected differently depending on whether the noise is coherent, such as non-stationary noise, or diffuse. In addition, the ACE corpus provides ground truth DRR in ISO frequency bands [9]. The capability of the DENBE algorithm to estimate DRR in ISO frequency bands is therefore explored using two different approaches based on filtering before the algorithm, and transforming the frequency dependent DRR available internally within the algorithm to the ISO preferred frequencies.

A particular challenge in estimating in frequency bands is that the bandwidth of speech does not occupy all of the ISO frequencies up to half the sample rate, and where there is no speech, noise will dominate. Estimating DRR in ISO frequency bands non-intrusively from speech is only being attempted very recently, and at the time of writing there are no published algorithmic papers on the subject.

The contribution of this paper is therefore to evaluate the recently proposed DENBE algorithm [8] on the ACE corpus alongside the methods of Falk *et al.* [10], and Jeub *et al.* [11] both in fullband and in one third-octave ISO subbands.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, the DENBE algorithm is reviewed. In Section 3, the approach to the performance evaluation is described. In Section 4, the results of the experiments including the results of DRR estimation in ISO frequency bands are discussed and in Section 5, conclusions are drawn.

2. REVIEW OF THE DENBE ALGORITHM

A speech signal, $x(t)$, continuous in time, radiating from a position in a room will follow multiple paths to any observation point comprising the direct path as well as reflections from the surfaces and objects in the room. The reverberant signal at the m-th microphone in an array of M microphones $y_m(t)$, in the room, is characterised by $h_m(t)$, the AIR of the acoustic channel between the source and

the m-th microphone as

$$y_m(t) = h_m(t) * x(t) + \nu_m(t), \tag{2}$$

where $\nu_m(t)$ is the additive noise at the m-th microphone. The AIR is a function of the room geometry, absorption of the surfaces of the room and its contents, the source and the microphone locations. Let

$$h_m(t) = h_{m,d}(t) + h_{m,r}(t), \tag{3}$$

where $h_{m,d}(t)$ and $h_{m,r}(t)$ are the impulse responses of the direct and reverberant paths for the m-th microphone respectively. The DRR at the m-th microphone, $\bar{\eta}_m$, is the ratio of the power arriving directly at the microphone from the source to power arriving after being reflected from one or more surfaces in the room [12]. It can be written as

$$\bar{\eta}_m = \frac{\int |h_{d,m}(t)|^2 dt}{\int |h_{r,m}(t)|^2 dt}. \tag{4}$$

When the impulse response is convolved with a speech signal, the observation at the m-th microphone is the Signal-to-Reverberation Ratio (SRR), γ, given by

$$\gamma_m = \frac{E\{|(h_{d,m}(t))^T * x(t)|^2\}}{E\{|(h_{r,m}(t))^T * x(t)|^2\}}. \tag{5}$$

The SRR is equal to the DRR in the case when $x(t)$ is spectrally white.

As the length of the signal $x(t)$ increases, γ_m at a given frequency will approach the DRR. In the DENBE algorithm, a null-steered beamformer is used to obtain the reverberant signal which is then rendered in Short Time Fourier Transform (STFT) frequency bands. The null in the beamformer is steered at the source thus cancelling the signal emanating directly from the source in the output of the beamformer. The output of the beamformer will thus consist largely of the reverberant signal. The amount of cancellation of the source is dependent on the frequency and the beamformer weights. Since the total signal is known, and the gain of the beamformer can be computed at a given frequency, it is therefore possible to determine the direct signal. After some manipulation then

$$\eta_m(j\omega) = \frac{E\{|Y_m(j\omega)|^2\} - E\{|V_m(j\omega)|^2\}}{\frac{1}{G^2(j\omega)}(E\{|Z_y(j\omega)|^2\} - E\{|Z_\nu(j\omega)|^2\})} - 1. \tag{6}$$

where $Y_m(j\omega)$ is the total noisy reverberant speech spectrum at the mth microphone, $V_m(j\omega)$ is the total noise spectrum at the mth microphone, $G(j\omega)$ is the frequency dependent gain of the beamformer, $Z_y(j\omega)$ is the total beamformer output, and $Z_\nu(j\omega)$ is the noise at the beamformer output. The overall DRR is then given by

$$\bar{\eta}_m = \frac{1}{\omega_2 - \omega_1} \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_2} \eta_m(j\omega)\, d\omega, \tag{7}$$

where $\omega_1 \leqslant \omega \leqslant \omega_2$ is the frequency range of interest. The frequency dependent DRR in one third-octave ISO frequency bands is obtained by determining a matrix of weights for each STFT frequency band relative to one third-octave ISO frequency bands and then multiplying the vector of frequency dependent STFT DRR by the weights matrix.

3. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The performance evaluation of the DENBE algorithm was performed using the Chromebook (laptop) two-channel dataset of the Evaluation stage software provided by the ACE challenge. The ACE challenge corpus [7] comprises 4500 noisy reverberant speech files. This is based on 5 male and 5 female talkers with 5 utterances each of different lengths of anechoic speech. Three different SNRs are used: High (18 dB), Medium (12 dB), and Low (−1 dB). Three different noise types are applied: Ambient which is the sound of the room with no speech, Fan, the sound of the room with one or more fans operating, and Babble, the sound of multiple talkers speaking simultaneously in the room reading from TIMIT passages or scientific papers. AIRs from 5 different rooms each with two different microphone positions are convolved with the anechoic speech and then mixed with noise using the *v_addnoise* function [13].

The DENBE algorithm requires the ground truth noise and the DoA. Since the ground truth noise and DoA were not available, additional pre-processing was performed resulting in several variants of the DRR estimation algorithm test. In all variants time alignment of the two input channels was applied using *sigalign.m* [13]. In the first variant denoted C, no noise reduction was applied, and fullband DRR was estimated. In the second variant, denoted D, spectral subtraction was performed using minimum statistics [13, 14], and fullband DRR estimated. In the third variant, denoted E, spectral subtraction was performed using Minimum Mean Squared Error (MMSE) power estimation [13, 15], and fullband DRR estimated.

A further two variants of third variant were devised. The third variant was chosen for further experiments since it was shown in [16] that the MMSE noise power estimation was the most effective in the SNR range of the ACE Challenge datasets. In the fifth variant, denoted F, DRR estimates in one third-octave ISO frequency bands were derived by transforming the results of the DRR estimate for each STFT frequency band in (6) into one third-octave ISO frequency bands. In the sixth variant, denoted G, DRR esti-



Figure 1: DRR estimation error for Ambient noise for computation methods A to E for low (−1 dB), medium (12 dB) and high (18 dB) SNRs



Figure 2: DRR estimation error for Fan noise for computation methods A to E for low (−1 dB), medium (12 dB) and high (18 dB) SNRs



Figure 3: DRR estimation error for Babble noise for computation methods A to E for low (−1 dB), medium (12 dB) and high (18 dB) SNRs

mates in one third-octave ISO frequency bands were obtained by filtering the input to the algorithm using an 8th order Butterworth filter and estimating the DRR using (7) over all STFTfrequency bands as in the fullband DENBE algorithm. In addition, two baselines were used for comparison of the fullband DRR results, Falk *et al.* [10], and Jeub *et al.* [11] denoted A and B respectively.

Whilst the DENBE algorithm is computationally efficient, it is expected that variant G will have a much higher Real-Time Factor (RTF) than the other variants of DENBE since the fullband DRR estimation must be performed in every frequency band up to half the sample rate.

In addition to estimation performance, the RTF of each method



Figure 4: DRR estimation error for Ambient noise for computation methods F (upper plot) and G (lower plot) for high (18 dB) SNRs

was compared. Algorithm A was tested using Matlab on an Intel Xeon X5675 processor with a clock speed of 3.07 GHz, whilst algorithms B to G were tested using Matlab on an Intel Xeon E5-2643 processor with a clock speed of 3.30 GHz. These two processors have similar levels of performance.

4. RESULTS

Results for algorithms A to E in the three noise types, Ambient, Fan, and Babble are shown in Figs. 1, 2, and 3 respectively. On each box, the central mark is the median, the edges of the box are the 25th and 75th percentiles, the whiskers extend to the most extreme data points not considered outliers. Outliers are not shown. Method C gives better performance than the baselines under all conditions. With the addition of noise reduction in methods D and E, the estimation performance is greatly improved for fan and ambient noise regardless of the method of noise reduction.

Results in one third-octave ISO frequency bands for algorithms F and G in the three noise types at 18 dB SNRs are shown in Figs.



Figure 5: DRR estimation error for Fan noise for computation methods F (upper plot) and G (lower plot) for high (18 dB) SNRs



Figure 6: DRR estimation error for Babble noise for computation methods F (upper plot) and G (lower plot) for high (18 dB) SNRs

4 to 6. Algorithm F achieves some success at 200 Hz and above in ambient and fan noise, and above 1200 Hz in babble noise. Below 200 Hz the algorithm is is unable to estimate the DRR and is returning a value of -20 dB in most cases. As such the error is large and negative with a small variance. Algorithm G achieves better performance below around 250 Hz. This suggests that a combination of the two algorithms using the results of F above 200 Hz and the results of G below 200 Hz would be a better estimator than either estimator on its own. However, the variance in most frequency bands is large. Further investigation is required to determine whether this information would be useful to a dereverberation algorithm or a speech recognizer.

Table 1 shows the RTF for each algorithm computed by dividing the total CPU time used to process all 4500 noisy reverberant speech files in the ACE Evaluation dataset by the combined length of all the noisy reverberant speech files.

Table 1: Comparison of RTF

A [10]	B [11]	C [8]	D [8]	E [8]	F [8]	G [8]
0.082	0.016	0.029	0.054	0.038	0.036	0.69

5. CONCLUSION

The ACE Challenge has provided an opportunity to evaluate the DENBE algorithm on real recordings of AIRs and noise in contrast to the previously reported performance which was on simulated data. Also, the speech in the ACE corpus is free-running and less uniform than the TIMIT database used in [8], and so is representative of natural rather than read speech. The estimation performance in fullband compares very favourably with existing methods, and has a low RTF making it suitable for real-time applications. The performance in one third-octave ISO frequency bands has also been demonstrated. This is a very recent area of research and the initial results based on small additions to the published algorithm produce encouraging results.

6. REFERENCES

[1] A. Farina, "Simultaneous measurement of impulse response and distortion with a swept-sine technique," in *Proc. Audio Eng. Soc. (AES) Convention*, no. 108, Feb 2000, pp. 1–23. [Online]. Available: http://www.aes.org/e-lib/browse.cfm?elib=10211

[2] ISO, *ISO-3382 Acoustics - Measurement of the Reverberation Time of Rooms with Reference to Other Acoustical Parameters*, Intl. Org. for Standardization (ISO) Recommendation ISO-3382, May 2009.

[3] J. Eaton, N. D. Gaubitch, and P. A. Naylor, "Noise-robust reverberation time estimation using spectral decay distributions with reduced computational cost," in *Proc. IEEE Intl. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, Vancouver, Canada, May 2013, pp. 161–165.

[4] J. S. Garofolo, "Getting started with the DARPA TIMIT CD-ROM: An acoustic phonetic continuous speech database," National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Gaithersburg, Maryland, Technical Report, Dec. 1988.

[5] J. B. Allen and D. A. Berkley, "Image method for efficiently simulating small-room acoustics," *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 943–950, Apr. 1979.

[6] A. Varga and H. J. M. Steeneken, "Assessment for automatic speech recognition II: NOISEX-92: a database and an experiment to study the effect of additive noise on speech recognition systems," *Speech Communication*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 247–251, July 1993.

[7] J. Eaton, N. D. Gaubitch, A. H. Moore, and P. A. Naylor, "The ACE challenge - corpus description and performance evaluation," in *Proc. IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics (WASPAA)*, New Paltz, NY, USA, 2015.

[8] J. Eaton, A. Moore, P. A. Naylor, and J. Skoglund, "Direct-to-reverberant ratio estimation using a null-steered beamformer," in *Proc. IEEE Intl. Conf. on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, Brisbane, Australia, Apr. 2015, pp. 46–50.

[9] ISO, *ISO-266 Acoustics - Preferred frequencies*, Intl. Org. for Standardization (ISO) Recommendation ISO-266, Mar. 1997.

[10] T. H. Falk and W.-Y. Chan, "Temporal dynamics for blind measurement of room acoustical parameters," *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 978–989, 2010.

[11] M. Jeub, C. Nelke, C. Beaugeant, and P. Vary, "Blind estimation of the coherent-to-diffuse energy ratio from noisy speech signals," in *Proc. European Signal Processing Conf. (EUSIPCO)*, Barcelona, Spain, 2011, pp. 1347–1351.

[12] P. A. Naylor and N. D. Gaubitch, Eds., *Speech Dereverberation*. Springer, 2010.

[13] D. M. Brookes, "VOICEBOX: A speech processing toolbox for MATLAB," http://www.ee.ic.ac.uk/hp/staff/dmb/voicebox/voicebox.html, 1997–2015.

[14] R. Martin, "Noise power spectral density estimation based on optimal smoothing and minimum statistics," *IEEE Trans. Speech Audio Process.*, vol. 9, pp. 504–512, July 2001.

[15] T. Gerkmann and R. C. Hendriks, "Unbiased MMSE-based noise power estimation with low complexity and low tracking delay," *IEEE Trans. Audio, Speech, Lang. Process.*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1383–1393, May 2012.

[16] J. Eaton, M. Brookes, and P. A. Naylor, "A comparison of Non-Intrusive SNR estimation algorithms and the use of mapping functions," in *Proc. European Signal Processing Conf. (EUSIPCO)*, Marrakech, Morocco, Sept. 2013, pp. 1–5.